

## REMARKS

Claims 2-11, 16, 17, 34-48 and 41-45 are currently pending, with claims 34 and 41 being the independent claims. Claims 16, 34, 41 and 42 have been amended. Claims 44 and 45 have been added. Support for the amendments to claims 34 and 41 may be found, for example, at pg. 14, lines 18-21 of the specification. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, independent claims 34 and 41, and dependent claims 2, 4-11, 16, 17, 35-38, 42 and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over JP 2000-176964 (“‘964”) in view of “What is Injection Molding”, Intelligent Systems Laboratory (“ISL”) and JP 05050433 (“‘433”), while dependent claim 3 was rejected as unpatentable over ‘964 and ‘433 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,484,642 (“*Bompard*”). For the following reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all claims of the present application are patentable over the cited references.

The Office Action (pg. 2) states:

Once the Examiner provides a rationale tending to show that the claimed product appears to be the same or similar to that of the prior art, although produced by a different process, the burden shifts to applicant to come forward with evidence establishing an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art

...

Therefore, in the instant case, the burden is shifted to the Applicant to show that the process differences result in an unobvious difference between the claimed process and the prior art product.

However, Applicants met the foregoing burden in the Amendment filed July 21, 2005. For example, we previously stated, “claim 34 recites a casing part having a reinforcing core material which “is preliminarily formed before the first and second resin surface layers are injection molded on the reinforcing core material.” This step of preliminarily forming the reinforcing core material imparts distinctive structural characteristics to the product, namely, increased structural strength. See, e.g., lines 12-15 on page 5 (‘By comprising a two-dimensional reinforcing core material it is possible to maintain strength even with small thicknesses, thus contributing to lighter weight and smaller size.’)”. In the July 21, 2005 amendment, we also stated that “claim 41 recites a casing for a portable electronic device comprising a core preform of a predetermined shape, which is embedded between two resin surface layers which are injection molded onto opposite sides of the core preform. The step(s) of injection molding the two sides of the core, thereby embedding it between the two resin layers, imparts distinctive structural characteristics to the

product, namely, strengthening the structural integrity of the casing. Furthermore, Claim 41 recites that the core preform is impregnated with thermoplastic resin before the resin surface layers are injected molded onto it. This step of impregnating before injection molding imparts distinctive structural characteristics to the product, i.e., integrating the surface layer and the core perform, thereby providing a firm bond.”

In addition, we previously stated “claim 41 recites a resin-made structural member extending from the first resin surface layer, where the resin-made structural member is formed by the same step of injection molding which formed the first resin surface layer. This step(s) of forming structural members extending from a resin surface layer in the same mold as the resin surface layer and at the same time imparts distinctive structural characteristics to the product, namely, the integration of the structural member with the resin layer from which it extends, and, in turn, the greater integration and bonding of the structural member with the core perform under the resin layer”. In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully asserts that the burden to show that the process differences result in an unobvious difference between the claimed process and the prior art product was met by the Amendment filed July 21, 2005.

In any event, independent claims 34 and 41 have been amended to recite the limitations “a multi-dimensional reinforcing core material having a curved shape and at least two surfaces” and “a multi-dimensional core preform for reinforcing the casing, wherein said core preform is premolded from a mesh impregnated with a thermoplastic resin, and wherein said multi-dimensional core preform is premolded into a predetermined curved shape,” respectively. Support for this amendment may be found, for example at, at pg. 14, lines 18-21 of the specification. No new matter has been added.

The Office Action (pg. 3) states:

Applicant has not provided any evidence which compares the claimed product to the product of the prior art. Applicant asserts that the specification states that preliminary forming imparts increased strength to the material, but this statement does not compare the claimed invention to the prior art product.

With respect to the foregoing statement, there is nothing in ‘964, *ISL* nor ‘433 that would teach or suggest (i) “a multi-dimensional reinforcing core member having a curved shape and at least two surfaces; (ii) a first resin surface layer covering a first of the at least two surfaces of said multi-dimensional reinforcing core material”; (iii) “a second resin surface layer covering a second of the at least two surfaces of said multi-dimensional reinforcing core material on a side opposite to said first surface, said second resin surface layer being integrated with said first resin

surface layer on at least a part of said second resin surface layer”; and (iv) “a resin-made structural member formed integrally with at least one of said first and second resin surface layers and protruding from said at least one of said first and second resin surface layers” recited in amended independent claim 34, or at least the “multi-dimensional core preform for reinforcing the casing” recited in amended independent claim 41.

The ‘964, *ISL* and ‘433 reference each teach the use of a core resin, but none of these references discuss anything about the shape or configuration of the disclosed core. Amended independent claims 31 and 34 each states that the core is multi-dimensional. In view of the foregoing, ‘964, *ISL* and ‘433 fail to teach or suggest the invention recited in amended independent claims 34 and 41, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 are therefore in order, and a notice to that effect is requested.


Moreover, dependent claims 44 and 45 recite that the reinforcing core member or core perform is two or three-dimensional. There is nothing in the cited prior art to teach or suggest such a claimed structure of a core. Consequently, dependent claims 44 and 45 are patentable over ‘964, *ISL* and ‘433, individually or in combination, for this additional reason.

In view of the patentability of independent claims 34 and 41, for the reasons set forth above, dependent claims 2-11, 16, 17, 35-38, as well as new dependent claims 44 and 45 are all patentable over the prior art.

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is in condition for allowance. Early passage of this case to issue is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

COHEN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE

By   
Michael C. Stuart  
Reg. No. 35,698  
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210  
New York, New York 10176  
(212) 687-2770

Dated: March 13, 2006